



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/285,649	04/05/99	GIORGIO	P Q-53806

SUGHRUE MION ZINN  
MACPEAK & SEAS  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20037-3202

IM22/0927

EXAMINER

OHORODNIK, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1764

DATE MAILED:

09/27/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/285,649	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GIORGIO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Susan K. Ohorodnik, Ph.D.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☒ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) 08/860,960.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                  | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                         | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3</u> . | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 08/860,960, filed on 06/24/97.

### *Specification*

2. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-9, 11-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konoki et al. (United States Patent No. 4,334,096).

With respect to claims 7 and 11, Konoki discloses a plant (figs. 1 and 2) comprised of a urea synthesis reactor (2); a first stripping unit (3) connected to the reactor; a means for condensing the vapors from the stripper (4, 12) and recycling the solution back to the reactor (8); a recovery section after the first stripper for separating the urea from a carbamate solution (the section is made of elements 6, 17 and 20); a second stripper (6 or 17); and means for condensing the vapors from the second

Art Unit: 1764

stripper (4, 12). The only difference between Konoki and the instant invention is that Konoki uses different terminology for describing the strippers and condensing means. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention that the elements of Konoki are performing the same function as the instant inventions and that there is no significant structural difference required by the instant claim.

With respect to claims 8 and 12, Konoki discloses that the means for condensing (4, 11) the vapors from the second stripper is the same as the means for condensing the first stripper.

With respect to claims 9, 13 and 15, Konoki discloses means for feeding a flow from the second stripper to the recovery section (15, 16). Figure 2 shows the embodiment wherein first and second strippers (3, 6) separately connect to the stripper (17) in the recovery section.

5. Claims 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finneran et al. (United States Patent No. 3,232,982) and Dewling et al. (United States Patent No. 2,848,493).

With respect to claims 10 and 14, Finneran discloses a plant (the figure) comprised of a urea synthesis reactor (2); a first stripping and condensing unit (14) connected to the reactor; a recovery section (including elements 32, 38, 44, 52); and means for feeding a carbamate solution to the stripping unit (62, col 7, Ins 36-41). The only difference between the plant of Finneran and the instant invention is that the first stripping unit and the condensing means are not separate elements, but are a two

Art Unit: 1764

compartment vessel with the upper part of the vessel being the stripper and the lower part a condenser (col 5, Ins 59-65 and col 6, Ins 16-21). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention that the stripping unit and means of condensing of the instant invention does not require any structure that differs from the first heating and carbamate condensing zone of Finneran, since they perform the same functions.


### **Conclusion**

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan K. Ohorodnik, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 703-306-5463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marian Knode can be reached on 703-308-4311. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

sko  
September 25, 2000

  
Shrive Beck  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700